not need obstruction and marking lighting. Since CWS's proposed lattice structure has a height of 150 feet, it would also pose no hazard to air navigation. (See Exhibit J, FAA Determination Letter, dated May 1, 2002.)

(5) Satellite and microwave dishes attached to towers and monopoles shall not exceed six (6) feet in diameter.

CWS will take all steps to ensure that satellite and microwave dishes installed by wireless carriers on the lattice structure do not exceed six (6) feet in diameter.

(6) Any telecommunication facility and antenna located in a district or immediately adjacent to a district permitting residences shall be located to a height that is equal to or less than the distance from the base of the antenna, tower or monopole to the closest property line, (1) one foot setback for each (1) one foot of facility height. Within and adjacent to districts not allowing residences, telecommunication towers and monopoles shall not be located any closer than one (1) foot for every five (5) feet in height to any property line. Associated structures and buildings, in both instances, may be constructed within the setback areas of the tower or monopole, however, they must meet all setback requirements for primary structures for the specific zoning district in which they are located.

The proposed lattice structure is located approximately 550 feet from the nearest property line of the R-1 district located to the northwest and northeast of the parcel on which it's located. This complies with the required minimum setback of 140 feet.

(7) Unmanned equipment structure(s) shall not contain more than 500 feet of total gross floor area per telecommunications provider on each site. Structures shall not exceed 12 feet in height.

The ancillary one-story equipment buildings will be less than 12 feet tall. No equipment building on site will exceed 12' x 32', or 384 square feet in total gross floor area.

(8) Unless otherwise required by the Federal Communications Commission or the Federal Aviation Administration, towers and monopoles shall blend with the background.

The lattice structure itself will be gray galvanized steel. The FAA has determined that a structure with a height of up to 170 feet at this location does not pose a hazard to air navigation and, therefore, does not need to be painted a more visually obtrusive color. Since CWS's proposed lattice structure has a height of 150 feet, it would also pose no hazard to air

navigation and would not need to be painted a more visually obtrusive color. (See Exhibit J, FAA Determination Letter, dated May 1, 2002.)

(9) No signals or lights or illumination shall be permitted on a tower or Monopole, unless required by the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Aviation Administration, State or Federal authorities, or the County. These structures must either maintain a galvanized steel finish, subject to any applicable standards of the FAA, or be painted a neutral color to reduce visual impact.

The FAA has determined that a structure with a height of up to 170 feet at this location does not pose a hazard to air navigation and, therefore, does not need obstruction and marking lighting. Since CWS's proposed lattice structure has a height of 150 feet, it would also pose no hazard to air navigation. (See Exhibit J, FAA Determination Letter, dated May 1, 2002.) The lattice structure will have a galvanized steel finish.

(10) No commercial advertising or signs shall be allowed on a tower or associated structures.

CWS will permit no commercial advertising or signs on the lattice structure or associated structures.

(11) No tower or monopole shall be located within a County designated historical district.

The proposed lattice structure is not located within a County designated historic District.

(12) Special exception conditions for approval, established by the Board of Supervisors, may include reasonable limitations on the time period upon which the commercial telecommunications use(s) cease, before the tower or monopole will be required to be removed. Removal is subject to the terms identified in 11-107.2. The site shall be restored as closely as possible to its original condition.

No response required.

(13) Applicants for any commercial public telecommunication facility shall demonstrate that they have complied with applicable regulations of the FCC and the FAA.

See Exhibit J, FAA Determination Letter.

(14) When locating on Fauquier County Water and Sanitation Authority, or fire and/or rescue company site: 1) the telecommunication equipment shall not interfere with the existing equipment of the primary use; and 2)

the setback provisions of Section 11-102.2.b(6) shall not apply.

Not applicable.

In addition, the landscaping/buffering provisions of the ordinance may be reduced or waived if the site has been developed in accordance with Sections 11-103 and 11-104.

The proposed structure will be located in the midst of mature woods. A 500 foot buffer of trees will largely conceal the structure from the nearest off-site residential units, which are in the 7900 block of Nokesville Road. A 100-foot buffer of trees will largely conceal the structure from the golf driving range and the residential unit located on the parcel in question. (See Exhibit E, Site Plan) Since the existing trees of trees provides adequate buffering and camouflaging, CWS requests that the Board of Supervisors reduce the 1,000-foot setback from a residential unit.

Applicants proposing a new telecommunication tower or monopole within one (1) mile of a County designated historic district, historic resources designated within the Comprehensive Plan, or a Virginia Byway if a telecommunication facility is proposed on a property listed on the National Register of Historic Places, shall submit a minimum of three (3) visual simulations and written justification as to why the facility could not be sited elsewhere.

Not applicable.

(15) Telecommunication towers or monopoles shall not be located along ridge lines, but downslope from the top of ridge lines, to protect views of the County mountains.

The proposed lattice structure is not located anywhere near a ridge line.

(16) Applications shall submit documentation, in written and graphic form regarding the service area to be provided by the proposed telecommunication tower or monopole. This includes propagation maps demonstrating that these facilities, with collocation capabilities, are no higher in elevation than necessary.

The Radio Frequency Manager for Sprint PCS, Shideh Dalilatojary, states in a letter, dated May 13, 2002, that co-locating on CWS's proposed lattice structure would enable Sprint to meet its objective of providing wireless service along US 29/15, Rt.28, Rt.655, Rt.661 and Rt.786, as well as the surrounding areas. (See Exhibit H, Propagation Maps.) Sprint emphacizes the importance of providing reliable wireless service to motorists along the heavily traveled US 29/15 corridor connecting Fauquier and Culpeper Counties. Sprint would need to co-

locate on the 150' CWS structure at a height of 135' in order to hand off to the other three Sprint Sites: the NCT Opal monopole, the SBA lattice structure and the NCT Bealeton lattice structure. Sprint has determined that there are no existing structures within 1 mile of CWS's proposed lattice structure that would sufficiently meet Sprint's coverage objectives from a radio frequency perspective. (See Exhibit M, Statement of Engineer, and Exhibit H, Propagation Maps.)

(17) An application must include a licensed carrier either as an applicant or co-applicant.

Attached is a letter from Sprint PCS, dated March 15, 2002, expressing their interest in co-locating on the lattice structure. (See Exhibit I.)

- c. Additional Submission Requirements. In addition to Section 5-011.II, the following additional information shall be submitted by applicants for towers or monopoles which require special exception or special permit approval:
 - (1) A map showing the telecommunication system of which the proposed use shall be an integral part, together with a written statement outlining the functional relationship of the proposed facility use to the utility system.

Not applicable. CWS is not itself a wireless service provider; rather, it develops infrastructure on which wireless service providers lease space. Therefore, CWS does not have a service map. CWS maximizes colocation by (i) developing telecommunications facilities to accommodate multiple service providers, and (ii) identifying locations where there is a demand and need for new, improved or expanded wireless telecommunications coverage. Sprint has stated that co-locating on CWS's proposed structure will enable it to meet its objective of expanding wireless service in Fauquier County. (See Exhibit M, Statement of Engineer, and Exhibit H, Propagation Maps.)

(2) A statement, prepared by a certified engineer, giving the basic reasons for selecting the particular site as the location of the proposed facility and certifying that the proposed use will meet the performance standards of the district in which located.

CWS is not a wireless service provider, but, rather, an infrastructure provider. However, Sprint has stated that co-locating on CWS's proposed structure will enable it to meet its objective of expanding wireless service in Fauquier County. According to a letter from the Radio Frequency Manager for Sprint PCS, Shideh Dalilatojary, dated May 13, 2002, co-locating on CWS's proposed lattice structure would enable Sprint to provide wireless service along US 29/15, Rt.28, Rt.655, Rt.661 and Rt.786, as well as the surrounding areas. Sprint emphasizes the importance of providing reliable wireless service to motorists along the

heavily traveled US 29/15 corridor connecting Fauquier and Culpeper Counties. Sprint would need to co-locate on the 150' CWS structure at a height of 135' in order to hand off to the other three Sprint Sites: the NCT Opal monopole, the SBA lattice structure and the NCT Bealeton lattice structure. Sprint has determined that there are no existing structures within 1 mile of CWS's proposed lattice structure that would sufficiently meet Sprint's coverage objectives from a radio frequency perspective. (See Exhibit M, Statement of Engineer, and Exhibit H, Propagation Maps.)

Photo imagery or other visual simulation of the proposed telecommunication tower or monopole must be shown with the existing conditions of the site. This simulation shall be provided from a minimum of three (3) perspectives. The applicant shall address how the facility can be designed to mitigate the visual impact on area residents, facilities, and roads.

More specifically, a sight line presentation must be presented. A sight line shall be drawn from the three closest residential units included in the vicinity plan to the highest visible point on the personal wireless facility. If there are no residential units in the mandatory setback distance, reference 11-102.2a(1) and (b), the public rights-of-way will be used.

Each sight line shall be depicted in profile, drawn at 1 inch equals 40 feet. The profiles shall show all intervening tree masses and buildings. In the event there is only 1 or 2 residential buildings on the vicinity plan, there shall be at least two sight lines from the closest habitable structures if any.

Photographs: (1) 4 x 6 inch photograph from three perspectives demonstrating existing conditions, one sight line from each residential unit; (2) photosimulation from the same three perspectives with the proposed wireless facility included. If there are no residential units in the project area, then the views shall be from the public right-of-way.

See Exhibit K, Photo-Simulations.

(3) Except for areas where permitted by right, an applicant for the proposed telecommunication facility must demonstrate that an antenna location on an existing facility is not feasible.

The County's objective is that no new tower/monopole shall be permitted unless the applicant demonstrates to the reasonable satisfaction of the Board of Supervisors that no existing tower, monopole or structure can accommodate the applicant's proposed antenna.